UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,445	01/14/2004	Eric R. Soldan	MS1-1790US	7839

22801 7590 05/04/2009

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
QUELER, ADAM M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/759,445	SOLDAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adam M. Queler	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 September 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-8,10,12-15,17-22 and 24-41* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *17-21 and 26-40* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-8,10,12-15,22,24,25 and 41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 02/26/2009.

2. Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 12-15, 17-22, 24-41 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 12-15, 22, 24-25 and 41 are elected. Claims 1, 10, and 22 are elected independent claims.

3. The rejection of claim 6 under §112 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Election/Restrictions

4. Claims 17-21 and 26-40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 7/12/2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1,3-7,10,12-15,22,24,25 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair et al. (US 20040133855 A1, 7/8/2004), and further in view of W3Schools.com, "CSS Pseudo-Classes", and further in view of Lakritz; David (US 6623529 B1, 09/23/2003), and further in view of "New Features in Internet Explorer 5" (11/14/2003), hereinafter IE5.

Regarding independent claim(s) 1, Blair discloses compiling formatted video content (XHTML and stylesheets, para. 28) into a serialized binary format (para. 7, binary code, para. 28). Blair discloses the formatted video content includes a markup language (para. 7). Blair teaches the process is specific to XML (para. 16). Blair teaches that a process that is specific to a predetermined client is used (para. 38). Blair teaches the process renders the video content in the serialized binary format so as to be consistent with the original markup language (para. 36).

Blair teaches that CSS is used in the markup language to be processed (para. 28), but does not explicitly disclose what specific selectors are used. W3Schools discloses CSS that select an element by pseudo-class (whole document). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Blair to process document with pseudo-class selectors, because pseudo-class selectors were a common element of the standard (W3schools, p. 4) of the standard known to be in documents processed by Blair (para. 28). The use of these selectors would also have enabled more flexibility in formatting pages (W3Schools, p. 1, line 1).

Blair and W3Schools do not disclose a dictionary for translation. Lakritz teaches a localization dictionary (termDB, col. 27, ll. 45-48) to translate a portion of textual words of formatted video content (HTML) into a plurality of languages (col. 27, ll. 40-55). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the localization of Lakritz in the above combination because it would have made it easy to add support for multiple languages and reduce maintenance (col. 28, ll. 6-14). The above combination does not disclose that the localization file is included in the content. IE5 teaches a web page (analogous to the content of Blair) including multiple files related to the web page (analogous to the localization dictionary). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the localization dictionary in the formatted video content, because it would enable easier transportation of the video content.

Regarding independent claim(s) 10, Blair teaches: capturing a presentation result of processed video content (resolving XHTML and CSS stylesheets, para. 28), wherein the presentation includes layout, rendering, UI interaction, and dynamic aspects of the video content (para. 36, the presentation includes everything from the original document, the layout and rendering are shown by the style resolution; and the dynamic aspects and user interaction are shown to be part of the presentation by the handlers [para. 64], re-layout [para. 67], and manipulation [para. 79]; see also para. 58); wherein processing is specific to XML format (para. 16); wherein the process is specific to a predetermined client (para. 20, specific embodiment where only one type of client is used); and creating a serialized binary bit stream corresponding to the presentation result (para. 28); wherein the bit steam facilitates visual rendering (para. 36) and end user interaction (para. 37) through a user interface (presentation engine, para. 7).

Blair teaches that CSS is used in the markup language to be processed (para. 28), but does not explicitly disclose what specific selectors are used. W3Schools discloses CSS that select an element by pseudo-class (whole document). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Blair to process document with pseudo-class selectors, because pseudo-class selectors were a common element of the standard (W3schools, p. 4) of the standard known to be in documents processed by Blair (para. 28). The use of these selectors would also have enabled more flexibility in formatting pages (W3Schools, p. 1, line 1).

Blair and W3Schools do not disclose a dictionary for translation. Lakritz teaches a localization dictionary (termDB, col. 27, ll. 45-48) to translate one or more textual words of formatted video content (HTML) into a plurality of languages (col. 27, ll. 40-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the localization of Lakritz in the above combination because it would have made it easy to add support for multiple languages and reduce maintenance (col. 28, ll. 6-14). The above combination does not disclose that the localization file is included in the content. IE5 teaches a web page (analogous to the content of Blair) including multiple files related to the web page (analogous to the localization dictionary). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the localization dictionary in the formatted video content, because it would enable easier transportation of the video content.

Regarding independent claim(s) 22, Blair discloses: storage (240) for video content in an original markup language that includes rendering UI interaction and dynamic aspects of the video content (para. 58); a head-end server (310) including a compiler (resolver) to compile the video content into video content in a binary format (320) that includes layout, rendering, UI interaction, and dynamic aspects of the video content (para. 36, the presentation includes everything from the original document, the layout and rendering are shown by the style

resolution; and the dynamic aspects and user interaction are shown to be part of the presentation by the handlers [para. 64], re-layout [para. 67], and manipulation [para. 79]; see also para. 58); wherein the process is specific to a predetermined client (para. 20, specific embodiment where only one type of client is used); and the process renders the video content in the serialized binary format so as to be consistent with the original markup language (para. 36).

Blair teaches that CSS is used in the markup language to be processed (para. 28), but does not explicitly disclose what specific selectors are used. W3Schools discloses CSS that select an element by pseudo-class (whole document). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Blair to process document with pseudo-class selectors, because pseudo-class selectors were a common element of the standard (W3schools, p. 4) of the standard known to be in documents processed by Blair (para. 28). The use of these selectors would also have enabled more flexibility in formatting pages (W3Schools, p. 1, line 1).

Blair and W3Schools do not disclose a dictionary for translation. Lakritz teaches a localization dictionary (termDB, col. 27, ll. 45-48) to translate a one or more textual words of formatted video content (HTML) into a plurality of languages (col. 27, ll. 40-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the localization of Lakritz in the above combination because it would have made it easy to add support for multiple languages and reduce maintenance (col. 28, ll. 6-14). The above combination does not disclose that the localization file is included in the content. IE5 teaches a web page (analogous to the content of Blair) including multiple files related to the web page (analogous to the localization dictionary). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to include the localization dictionary in the formatted video content, because it would enable easier transportation of the video content.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 3, Blair teaches the formatted video content includes source content in one or more language (para. 7). Blair teaches an email format (para. 15).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 4, Blair teaches translating the content in the binary format with DOM into a DOM hierarchy corresponding to the original content (para. 36). Blair teaches gathering all different styles based on all selectors (all CSS and inline styles, para. 28, a specific style is a selector). Blair teaches presenting the content using the DOM hierarchy (para. 28, the client engine works in conjunction with DOM API to process the tree structure). Blair does not explicitly disclose what specific selectors are used. W3Schools discloses CSS that select an element by pseudo-class (whole document). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Blair to process document with pseudo-class selectors, because pseudo-class selectors were a common element of the standard (W3schools, p. 4) of the standard known to be in documents processed by Blair (para. 28). The use of these selectors would also have enabled more flexibility in formatting pages (W3Schools, p. 1, line 1).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 12, Blair teaches translating the content in the binary format with DOM into a DOM hierarchy corresponding to the original content (para. 36).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 5, 13, Blair teaches that the invention is for optimized layout of the original web page. Therefore, Blair will present all the original features of the original web page such as layout, rendering, UI interaction, dynamic aspects, form elements, scrolling, navigation and event handling.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 6, 14, Blair does not explicitly the contents of the web pages that it processes. Official Notice is given that web pages at the time of the invention commonly contained an inline image and shape in which they are to be placed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Blair to process web pages with shapes and images because it would have been desirable to make Blair able to process commonly occurring web pages. Blair does not specifically recite reflowing such elements consistent with a display resolution and size, however it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so as an object of Blair was to adapt the style to the specific display (para. 38), and used reflow to accomplish this goal (para. 55).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 7, 15, 25, Blair teaches XHTML with CSS (para. 32).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 24, Blair teaches cable (para. 5).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 41, Blair teaches that CSS is used in the markup language to be processed (para. 28), but does not explicitly disclose what specific selectors are used. W3Schools discloses CSS that select an element by pseudo-class including links (p. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Blair to process document with pseudo-class selectors, because pseudo-class selectors were a common element of the standard (W3schools, p. 4) of the standard known to be in documents processed by Blair (para. 28). The use of these selectors would also have enabled more flexibility in formatting pages (W3Schools, p. 1, line 1).

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair, W3Schools, Lakritz and IE5 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Allen et al. (US 20050044499 A1, 02/24/2005).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 8, the above combination does not explicitly disclose converting the format of non-textual video content into one or more alternative non-textual formats. Allen teaches converting the format of non-textual video content into one more alternative non-textual formats (para. 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to converting the format of non-textual video content into one more alternative non-textual formats because it would be a better format for delivery (para. 28).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments, see 15-17, filed 2/26/2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 3-7, 10, 12-15, 22, 24, 25, and 41 under §103 under the prior art, specifically Parasnis have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Blair, in view of W3schools.com, in view of Lakritz, in view of IE5

10. Regarding claim 4, Applicant alleges the added limitation overcomes the prior art. However, Blair teaches gathering all different styles based on all selectors (all CSS and inline styles, para. 28, a specific style is a selector). W3schools shows the obviousness of having a pseudo class selector as described in the rejection above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam M. Queler whose telephone number is (571)272-4140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Adam M Queler/
Examiner, Art Unit 2178